

for a fiscal year under subparagraph (B) shall not exceed 25 percent of the annual rate of pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.”.

SEC. 4. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT.

(a) PROPERTY DISPOSAL LIMITATIONS.—Section 108(c)(3) of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 698v-6(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “The Trust may not dispose” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Trust may not dispose”;

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “The Trust” and inserting the following:

“(B) MAXIMUM DURATION.—The Trust”;

(3) in the last sentence, by striking “Any such” and inserting the following:

“(C) TERMINATION.—The”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) EXCLUSIONS.—For the purposes of this paragraph, the disposal of real property does not include the sale or other disposal of forage, forest products, or marketable renewable resources.”.

(b) LAW ENFORCEMENT AND FIRE MANAGEMENT.—Section 108(g) of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 698v-6(g)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) LAW ENFORCEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”;

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “The Trust” and inserting the following:

“(B) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The Trust”;

(3) by striking “At the request of the Trust” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting the following:

“(2) FIRE MANAGEMENT.—

“(A) NON-REIMBURSABLE SERVICES.—

“(i) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with the Trust, develop a plan to carry out fire preparedness, suppression, and emergency rehabilitation services on the Preserve.

“(ii) CONSISTENCY WITH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.—The plan shall be consistent with the management program developed pursuant to subsection (d).

“(iii) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—To the extent generally authorized at other units of the National Forest System, the Secretary shall provide the services to be carried out pursuant to the plan under a cooperative agreement entered into between the Secretary and the Trust.

“(B) REIMBURSABLE SERVICES.—To the extent generally authorized at other units of the National Forest System, the Secretary may provide presuppression and non-emergency rehabilitation and restoration services for the Trust at any time on a reimbursable basis.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

S. 212 was introduced by Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN to improve the management of the Valles Caldera National Preserve. In 2000, Congress passed the Valles Caldera Preservation Act, which acquired the Baca Ranch and directed the Secretary of Agriculture to manage it as a preserve.

While mostly successful, there have been some challenges to implementing the law. As a result, S. 212 was introduced to address these challenges and clarify the original intent of the act. Furthermore, it will ensure that the act is fully implemented in a cost-efficient manner.

I support this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from California has already explained the purpose of Senate bill 212, which is a Senate-passed measure dealing with a conservation unit located in the district of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), my colleague and cousin.

The Valles Caldera National Preserve, formerly known as the Baca Ranch, was authorized by Congress in 2000 to preserve certain natural, cultural, and recreational resources through a unique management arrangement. Since its establishment, the preserve has undergone some growing pains, which the provisions of S. 212 are intended to help address.

I want to commend the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) for his work and active support in helping to see that the Valles Caldera National Preserve achieves the purposes for which it was established.

Mr. Speaker, we support Senate bill 212 and urge adoption of the legislation by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield so much time as he may consume to the gentleman from the great State of New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), my cousin.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado yielding.

I rise today in support of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act of 2005. The original Valles Caldera Preservation Act was enacted in the 106th Congress and was signed into law on July 25, 2000.

This act directed the Forest Service to acquire the private Baca Ranch in northern New Mexico, which comprises nearly 95,000 acres. The United States acquired the entire surface estate and an undivided 87½ percent of the mineral estate. Third parties currently hold the outstanding 12½ percent of the mineral interest.

The original act directed the Forest Service to negotiate with the outstanding mineral interest owners for the acquisition of their interests. Un-

fortunately, there is a sizeable difference in what the Forest Service and the mineral rights owners believe to be the fair market value of the outstanding mineral interests; and for the past 5 years, there has been no significant effort to resolve the problem.

I believe that Senate bill 212, sponsored by Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN, and passed by the other Chamber on July 26, 2005, provides a reasonable method for resolving the differences in a timely fashion through a condemnation process. The outstanding mineral interest owners have advised each of us that they are in full support of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill, in addition to addressing the outstanding mineral interests, also addresses several issues that have been raised with respect to the administration of the trust. It is my belief that the bill appropriately provides for concerns of the Valles Caldera trust and the administration of the Baca Ranch in furthering the purposes for which these lands were acquired 4 years ago.

I urge my colleagues to support Senate bill 212, the Valles Caldera Preservation Act of 2005.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 212.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIAN PUEBLO LAND ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 279) to amend the Act of June 7, 1924, to provide for the exercise of criminal jurisdiction.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 279

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. INDIAN PUEBLO LAND ACT AMENDMENTS.

The Act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 636, chapter 331), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 20. CRIMINAL JURISDICTION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by Congress, jurisdiction over offenses committed anywhere within the exterior boundaries of any grant from a prior sovereign, as confirmed by Congress or the Court of Private Land Claims to a Pueblo Indian tribe of New Mexico, shall be as provided in this section.

“(b) JURISDICTION OF THE PUEBLO.—The Pueblo has jurisdiction, as an act of the Pueblos’ inherent power as an Indian tribe,

over any offense committed by a member of the Pueblo or an Indian as defined in title 25, sections 1301(2) and 1301(4), or by any other Indian-owned entity.

“(c) JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES.—The United States has jurisdiction over any offense described in chapter 53 of title 18, United States Code, committed by or against an Indian as defined in title 25, sections 1301(2) and 1301(4) or any Indian-owned entity, or that involves any Indian property or interest.

“(d) JURISDICTION OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO.—The State of New Mexico shall have jurisdiction over any offense committed by a person who is not a member of a Pueblo or an Indian as defined in title 25, sections 1301(2) and 1301(4), which offense is not subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 279, a bill sponsored by Senator DOMENICI, clarifies the uncertainty and potential law enforcement jurisdiction problems on all 19 Indian Pueblo reservations in the State of New Mexico.

From 1913 to 2001, the United States Government prosecuted crimes committed by or against the New Mexico Pueblo Indians within the exterior boundaries of their reservation lands in the State of New Mexico. However, in 2001, a Federal judge, relying on a case about tribal jurisdiction in the State of Alaska, ruled that felonies committed by Indians on private lands within the boundaries of New Mexico Pueblos are not subject to Federal jurisdiction. The U.S. Attorney for New Mexico did not appeal the decision and, therefore, has failed to prosecute any felonies by or against Indians on these lands.

At the same time that the Federal Government was declining to prosecute any felonies on Indian Pueblo lands, a New Mexico State court ruled that the State of New Mexico lacked jurisdiction to prosecute felonies committed by an Indian defendant against a non-Indian on private lands within the Pueblos. As a result, there is currently a large void in criminal jurisdiction at the Federal, State, and tribal levels.

S. 279 corrects this void of jurisdiction by clarifying that, one, the United States will have jurisdiction over crimes defined under the Major Crimes Act committed by or against any Indian; two, the State of New Mexico will have jurisdiction clarified as to non-

member Indians or non-Indians for all non-Major Crimes Act offenses; and, three, the New Mexico Pueblo governments will have jurisdiction over their individual members or other Indians for other offenses.

S. 279 enjoys bipartisan support and has the support of the entire New Mexico delegation. I look forward to passing this necessary legislation and urge its timely enactment in this session.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and to pay particular tribute to our colleague from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL). Mr. UDALL introduced a companion bill as H.R. 600, and he has been a true champion for passage of this important legislation. He has worked tirelessly to impress upon us the urgency and the timeliness of these provisions.

Once enacted, as my good friend from California pointed out, this language will clarify the boundaries of criminal jurisdiction among the State, county, and tribal governments for lands on and near the New Mexico Pueblos.

As a result of some recent court decisions in New Mexico, certain Indian lands have gone without any government protection from criminal acts. As the former Attorney General of New Mexico, Mr. UDALL understands fully that this put Native Americans in his district in a very perilous position.

I congratulate the gentleman from New Mexico for his tenacity in getting this issue to the forefront and commend him on the humility he showed in insisting the Senate bill be moved, rather than his own, in order to more quickly enact the legislation. Knowing him as I do, I am not surprised that he put doing the right thing for the Pueblos of New Mexico far ahead of scoring political points.

I strongly support this bill and urge all of our colleagues to support passage of Senate bill 279.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate bill 279, legislation that amends the Indian Pueblo Land Act of June 7, 1924, to provide for the exercise of criminal jurisdiction within the exterior boundaries of Pueblo lands. Earlier this session, I introduced a companion to this bill on behalf of myself and cosponsors HEATHER WILSON and STEVAN PEARCE.

This legislation addresses confusion over criminal jurisdiction on Pueblo lands in New Mexico that arose out of the holding in *United States v. Jose Gutierrez*, an unreported decision of a Federal district court judge in the district of New Mexico that overturned

prior precedent regarding the jurisdictional status of the lands within the exterior boundaries of Pueblo grants.

The Gutierrez decision created uncertainty and the potential for a void in criminal jurisdiction on Pueblo lands. Some call these prosecution-free zones. Because of the risk to public safety and law enforcement arising out of this uncertainty, it is important that we clarify the scope of criminal jurisdiction on Pueblo lands.

Nothing in this legislative clarification is intended to diminish the scope of Pueblo civil jurisdiction within the exterior boundaries of Pueblo grants, which is defined by Federal and tribal laws and court decisions.

□ 1445

This legislation also does not, in any way, diminish the exterior boundaries of these grants. The All-Indian Pueblo Council of the 19 Pueblo Governors has agreed to the language included in this legislation. The governors recognize the urgency of this matter and have come to Congress asking that we do everything in our power to avoid the unfathomable situation of creating places in New Mexico where someone could literally get away with murder. We here in Congress must also recognize the urgency of this situation and take action to address it.

By closing the criminal jurisdictional loophole, we have opened the doors to justice for victims and their families. The Pueblo members and victims who fought for this legislation have demonstrated an unrelenting dedication to change the system for the better, and in doing so, they have ensured that others will never face the same scary situation.

I want to thank all the New Mexicans who fought for this legislation. I also sincerely appreciate the work of my colleagues Representatives HEATHER WILSON and STEVAN PEARCE in the House and Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 279.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PITKIN COUNTY LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 2005

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1129) to authorize the exchange of certain land in the State of Colorado, as amended.